| 1 | | HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON |
|----------|--|--|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 7 | WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA | |
| 8 | REGINALD BELL, | CASE NO. C12-5215 RBL |
| 9 | Petitioner, | ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR |
| 10 | v. | RECONSIDERATION AND DENYING CERTIFICATE OF |
| 11 | JEFFERY UTTECHT, | APPEALABLITY |
| 12 | Respondent. | |
| 13 14 | THIS MATTED is before the Court on Dat | itionar's Mation for Pagansidaration [Dkt |
| 15 | THIS MATTER is before the Court on Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration [Dkt. #31] and his Request for a Certificate of Appealability. Both are related to this Court's Order | |
| 16 | | |
| | Denying Claims 1, 3 and 5 of Petitioner's habeus Petition [Dkt. #8], and re-referring Claims 2 | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | denied claims. | |
| 21 | Petitioner appealed this Court's Order, but now seeks Reconsideration of it. Under Fed. | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | by the District court without a remand from the appellate Court. These include Motions for a | |
| 24 | | |

| 1 | New Trial under Rule 59 and Motions for Relief from Judgment under Rule 60(b). If and to the | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | extent Petitioner's Motion for reconsideration under Local Rule 7(h) can be construed as a | |
| 3 | Motion under one of these Rules, the Motion is DENIED, as it fails to demonstrate a manifest | |
| 4 | error or a showing of new facts or authority. | |
| 5 | For the reasons already stated in the Report and Recommendation, the Petitioner's | |
| 6 | request for a Certificate of Appeal for the denied claims now on appeal is DENIED. | |
| 7 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 8 | Dated this 1st day of November, 2012. | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | Ronald B. Leighton | |
| 11 | United States District Judge | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |